

200312262-1

10/693,355

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the non-final Official Action mailed May 9, 2005. Reconsideration of the application in light of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 13, 15, 17, 18, 28, 38, 41, 44, 45, 48, 52, 53, 55 and 56 have been withdrawn under a previous election of species. Claims 22 and 30 were cancelled previously. New claim 71 has been added. Thus, claims 1-12, 14, 16, 19-21, 23-27, 29, 31-37, 39, 40, 42, 43, 46, 47, 49-51, 54 and 57-71 are pending for further action.

Unexamined Claims:

In Applicant's previous amendment, filed 22 February 2005, new claims 66-70 were added. The present Office Action treats claims 66-68, but does not mention or address claims 69 and 70.

Claims 69 and 70 were together on a single page of the previous amendment. Consequently, Applicant speculates that that page was perhaps misplaced by the Office when Applicant's response was processed in. In any case, claims 69 and 70 are present in the application, are included with the listing of claims in the present paper and should be examined.

Prior Art Issues:

With regard to the prior art, the Office Action rejects claims 1-12, 14, 16, 19-21, 23-27, 29, 31-37, 39, 40, 42, 43, 46, 47, 49-51, 54 and 57-68 as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of the teachings of U.S. Patent No. 6,626,543 to Derryberry ("Derryberry") taken alone. For at least the following reasons, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

200312262-1

10/693,355

Claim 1 recites:

A multimedia display device comprising:  
a docking station including speakers and a media drive;  
wherein said docking station is configured to structurally and communicatively  
couple an image projection device to said docking station.

Applicant notes that claim 1 calls for “a docking station including speakers and a media drive” and that is “configured to structurally and communicatively couple [with] an image projection device.” Claim 67 further states “wherein said image projection device is a separate self-contained unit that is selectively and releasably coupled to said docking station.” Derryberry does not teach or suggest such a device.

The only “docking station” taught by Derryberry is illustrated in Figs. 7 and 8. “As shown in FIGS. 7 and 8, the projector 10 could incorporate docking station connections 40 that could connect the projector 10 to a network docking station 42 or other networking device so that the presentation could be viewed remotely from the actual presentation.” (Derryberry, col. 4, lines 58-62). This “docking station” 42 does not include either speakers or a media drive, as claimed.

With regard to the disposition of speakers, Derryberry teaches “The projection device and/or the computer device could utilize speakers to present audio information.” (Derryberry, col. 3, lines 64-65). Derryberry does not anywhere teach or suggest that speakers could be incorporated into the docking station 42 as claimed.

Consequently, Derryberry does not teach or suggest the features of claim 1. “To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974).” M.P.E.P. § 2143.03. Accord. M.P.E.P. § 706.02(j). For at least this reason, the

200312262-1

10/693,355

rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims based on Derryberry should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

On this point, the recent Office Action points out that in Fig. 11 of Derryberry, the projector 10 can also serve as a docking station. (Office Action of 5/9/05, p. 2). However, this is inapplicable to claim 1. Claim 1 recites a docking station that is configured to receive the image projection device, not be the image projection device. This arrangement provides advantages not available in the prior art. As explained in Applicant's specification, this allows "the docking station (120) illustrated in Figure 1B [to] function as a standalone audio system when it is not coupled to an image projection device (110; Fig. 1A)." Derryberry does not teach or suggest any device arranged so as to produce this advantage of the claimed device. Again, the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims based on Derryberry should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 20 recites:

A method of coupling an image projection device to a media source comprising:

providing an independent image projection device;

providing a docking station for supporting said image projection device, said docking station comprising said media source; and

selectively coupling said image projection device to said docking station by mounting said image projection device onto said docking station; and

indicating with a dedicated indicator when said image projection device is successfully coupled to said docking station.

(emphasis added).

As demonstrated above, Derryberry does not teach or suggest a docking station that includes a "media source." Consequently, Derryberry cannot teach or suggest the claimed method of providing a docking station with such a media source to which an "independent image projection device" is "selectively coupled." Moreover, Derryberry does not teach or

200312262-1

10/693,355

suggest "indicating with a dedicated indicator when said image projection device is successfully coupled to said docking station."

The Office Action fails to indicate how or where Derryberry teaches the claimed subject matter of "indicating with a dedicated indicator when said image projection device is successfully coupled to said docking station." According to the Office Action, "it is not clear how the 'dedicated indicator' as set forth in the newly amended claim 20 patentably distinguishes over power button 24." (Action of 5/9/05, p. 7). This, however, should be clear to one of ordinary skill in the art.

A power button turns on the power to a device and may indicate whether the power is on or off. The claimed "dedicated indicator" performs the wholly separate function of indicating when an image projection device is successfully coupled to a docking station. The power button for the docking station or projection device would be a separate element and perform a different function.

In sum, the Office Action has failed to indicate how or where the prior art of record teaches the claimed method including "indicating with a dedicated indicator when said image projection device is successfully coupled to said docking station."

As stated in M.P.E.P. § 2143.03, "[t]o establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974)." M.P.E.P. § 2143.03. Accord. M.P.E.P. § 706.02(j). Consequently, because the prior art cited does not teach or suggest the features of claim 20, the rejection of claim 20 and its dependent claims based on Derryberry should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Similar to claim 1, claim 32 recites:

200312262-1

10/693,355

A multimedia display device comprising:  
a projection means for projecting an image; and  
a housing means including audio means for producing audio signals and media  
generating means for generating media signals;  
wherein said housing means is configured to structurally and communicatively  
couple said projection means, said housing means being further configured to  
selectively and releasably coupled with said projection means.

In contrast, as demonstrated above, Derryberry does not teach or suggest a housing  
means including audio means and means for generating media signals that is also configured  
to selectively and releasably couple with a separate projection means. "To establish prima  
facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or  
suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974)."

M.P.E.P. § 2143.03. Accord. M.P.E.P. § 706.02(j). For at least this reason, the rejection of  
claim 32 and its dependent claims based on Derryberry should be reconsidered and  
withdrawn.

Claim 42 recites:

A method of making a docking station configured to receive an image  
projection device comprising:  
forming a body of said docking station, wherein said body includes a media  
drive and a cavity configured to receive an image projection device; and  
disposing an electrical interconnect in said body;  
wherein said electrical interconnect is configured to electrically couple said  
docking station to said image projection device upon insertion of said image  
projection device into said cavity.

As demonstrated above, Derryberry does not teach or suggest a docking station that  
includes a media drive. Consequently, Derryberry cannot teach or suggest the method of  
claim 42 that includes forming a body of a docking station including a media drive.

"To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations  
must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580

200312262-1

10/693,355

(CCPA 1974)." M.P.E.P. § 2143.03. Accord. M.P.E.P. § 706.02(j). Consequently, the rejection of claim 42 and its dependent claims based on Derryberry should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 49 recites;

An image projector docking station comprising:  
a plurality of multimedia components including a speaker and a media drive;  
wherein said docking station is configured to structurally and communicatively  
couple an image projection device to said multimedia components.

As demonstrated above, Derryberry does not teach or suggest a docking station that includes speakers or a media drive and is configured to couple with an image projection device. "To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974)." M.P.E.P. § 2143.03. Accord. M.P.E.P. § 706.02(j). For at least this reason, the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims based on Derryberry should be reconsidered and withdrawn. Consequently, the rejection of claim 49 and its dependent claims based on Derryberry should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 58 recites:

An image projector configured to be docked in a docking station comprising an interface configured to communicatively couple said image projector to said docking station, wherein said image projector is further configured to receive a video signal from said docking station and to project images using said video signal.  
(emphasis added).

In contrast, Derryberry does not teach or suggest an image projector that is configured to receive a video signal from a docking station. The docking station (42) taught by Derryberry does not deliver a video signal to the docked projector. Rather, the docking

200312262-1

10/693,355

station receives a signal output by the projector and delivers that signal to a network "so that the presentation could be viewed remotely from the actual presentation." (Derryberry, col. 4, lines 60-62). Derryberry does not teach or suggest an image projector that is configured to dock with a docking station and receive a video signal from that docking station for projection.

"To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974)." M.P.E.P. § 2143.03. Accord. M.P.E.P. § 706.02(j). For at least this reason, the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims based on Derryberry should be reconsidered and withdrawn. Consequently, the rejection of claim 58 and its dependent claims based on Derryberry should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The various dependent claims pending in the application further recite additional subject matter that is neither taught nor suggested by the prior art of record. As demonstrated above, Derryberry does not teach or suggest a docking station with speakers and a media drive that is configured to couple with a projection device. Claim 5 further recites "wherein said video signal from said docking station is in sync with an audio signal output by said speakers of said docking station." Claim 31 recites similar subject matter. This subject matter is not taught or suggested by Derryberry.

Claim 16 further recites "two speakers configured to provide stereo sound." Claim 37 recites similar subject matter. Derryberry does not teach or suggest this subject matter as claimed.

Consequently, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under § 103(a) based on Derryberry of these claims is respectfully requested for at least these additional reasons.

200312262-1

10/693,355

The newly-added claims are all thought to be patentable over the prior art of record for at least their dependency on one of the claims discussed above. Accordingly, examination and allowance of the newly-added claims is respectfully requested.

For the foregoing reasons, the present application is thought to be clearly in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration of the application in light of these remarks is courteously solicited. If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions which could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven L. Nichols  
Registration No. 40,326

DATE: 3 August 2005

Steven L. Nichols, Esq.  
Managing Partner, Utah Office  
**Rader Fishman & Grauer PLLC**  
River Park Corporate Center One  
10653 S. River Front Parkway, Suite 150  
South Jordan, Utah 84095

(801) 572-8066  
(801) 572-7666 (fax)

**CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office facsimile number 571-273-8300 on August 3, 2005. Number of Pages: 26



Brian J. Riddle